



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/083,637	02/27/2002	Craig Mayo	3691-368	1812

7590 12/04/2003

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.
8th Floor
1100 North Glebe Road
Arlington, VA 22201

EXAMINER

BUCHANAN, CHRISTOPHER R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3627

DATE MAILED: 12/04/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/083,637

Applicant(s)

MAYO ET AL.

Examiner

Christopher R Buchanan

Art Unit

3627

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li alone.

With regard to claim 1, Li discloses a method of handling vehicle warranty claims (see abstract) that includes a customer taking a damaged vehicle to a retailer (col. 3 line 32+, col. 4 line 46+), a technician analyzing the damage and determining the cause of the damage (col. 4 line 19+, col. 4 line 45+, col. 7 line 42+), processing the claim to get the damage repaired depending on the nature of the damage (col. 8 line 9+), and informing the customer whether the damage is covered by the warranty (col. 6 line 48+, col. 7 line 62+). It would be obvious to one skilled in the art that the damage to the vehicle could be a variety of types, including window damage. With regard to claims 2-4, it would be obvious to one skilled in the art to order replacement parts from the appropriate sources and to bill for services and parts accordingly.

Art Unit: 3627

3. Claims 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li in view of Busche.

The method of Li differs from the claimed method in that it does not include providing the retailer with statistical information and analysis regarding warranty claims [claims 5-7].

Busche discloses a method of handling vehicle warranty claims that includes providing the retailer with statistical information and analysis regarding warranty claims (col. 10 line 23+, col. 11 line 50+).

It would be obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the method of Li to include providing the retailer with statistical information and analysis regarding warranty claims, as taught by Busche, to help provide retailers with a better understanding of the products and the warranty claims that occur.

4. Claims 8-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li in view of Busche.

With regard to claims 8 and 12, Li discloses a method of handling vehicle warranty claims (see abstract) that includes a customer taking a damaged vehicle to a retailer (col. 3 line 32+, col. 4 line 46+) and a technician analyzing the damage and determining the cause of the damage (col. 4 line 19+, col. 4 line 45+, col. 7 line 42+). It would be obvious to one skilled in the art that the damage to the vehicle could be a variety of types, including window damage. With regard to claims 10 and 11, the method includes ordering replacement parts from the

Art Unit: 3627

appropriate sources and processing the claim to get the damage repaired depending on the nature of the damage (col. 8 line 9+).

The method of Li differs from the claimed method in that it does not include providing the retailer with statistical information and analysis regarding warranty claims [claims 8, 9, and 12].

Busche discloses a method of handling vehicle warranty claims that includes providing the retailer with statistical information and analysis regarding warranty claims (col. 10 line 23+, col. 11 line 50+).

It would be obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the method of Li to include providing the retailer with statistical information and analysis regarding warranty claims, as taught by Busche, to help provide retailers with a better understanding of the products and the warranty claims that occur.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Busch et al. disclose a method for inspecting vehicle damage and repairs. Dalphy et al. disclose a method for facilitating computer component repair.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher R Buchanan whose telephone number is 703-306-5782. The examiner can normally be reached on M-T 9-7.

Art Unit: 3627

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Olszewski can be reached on 703-308-5183. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-7687 for regular communications and 703-305-7687 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1113.



Christopher Buchanan
November 18, 2003

Michael Cuff 11/25/03
MICHAEL CUFF
PRIMARY EXAMINER